

**REPLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1796**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Alexander V. Lubnin et al.

CUSTOMER NO.: 37535

Serial No.: 10/733,027

Docket No. 201CT033A

Filed: December 11, 2003

Art Unit: 1796

Examiner: Patrick Dennis Niland

For: WATER DISPERSIONS OF NON-UNIFORM POLYURETHANE PARTICLES

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (including any paper or fee referred to herein) is being electronically submitted on the date indicated below and addressed to: MAIL STOP AF, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450, on

April 9, 2009
Date of Deposit

/ Cathy Bartel /
Cathy Bartel

MAIL STOP AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Dear Sir:

This is Applicant's summary of a telephone interview on April 1, 2009 for the captioned application.

Present:	For the PTO	For Applicant
	Examiner Dennis Patrick NILAND	Attorney Samuel LAFERTY

Sam called Examiner Niland on April 1st at 3:00 PM for a pre-arranged telephone interview to discuss the 35 U.S.C. §112 (first and second paragraph) rejection issues in the application. Sam had told Examiner Niland that he was going to propose putting

Interview Summary
Serial No. 10/733,027
April 9, 2009
Page 2

"isocyanate terminated" into claim 3 to resolve the issue but the insertion was going to go into elements a) and c) rather than in the preamble so that the issue of "capped isocyanate terminated prepolymers" could be dealt with by element b) of the claim. The Examiner indicated that such an amendment would seem to resolve the 35 U.S.C. §112 issue. While the Examiner wanted to take some more time to fully review the same, he indicated he was about 99.9% confident that further review would not find any problems. Sam indicated that support existed for the new insertion from claim 61, which was already allowed. The Examiner indicated that since we were moving "isocyanate terminated" from the preamble to the elements of the claim, he was not very concerned about the probability of inserting new matter by such an amendment. The interview was then concluded. No other matters were discussed, no exhibits were shared, and no other resolutions were made.

This is the sum and substance of the interview. No specific claims were considered other than claim 3. No prior art references were discussed.

Applicant has reviewed the Examiner's written summary of the Interview and does not contest any of the statements made therein.

Should any additional fees be required to process this Amendment, Applicant hereby authorizes payment of said fees from deposit account 50-1501.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Samuel B. Laferty /
Samuel B. Laferty
Reg. No. 31,537

Legal Department
Lubrizol Advanced Materials, Inc.
9911 Brecksville Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44141-3247
Ph: (216) 447-5541